

**EDUCATION & YOUTH COMMITTEE
of the
Suffolk County Legislature**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Education & Youth Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **July 31, 2001**.

Members Present:

Legislator Vivian Fisher - Chairperson
Legislator Angie Carpenter - Vice-Chair
Legislator Jonathan Cooper
Legislator Brian Foley
Legislator Fred Towle
Legislator Andrew Crecca

Also in Attendance:

Paul Sabatino - Counsel to the Legislature
Elizabeth Nostrand - Aide to Legislator Fisher
Linda Bay - Aide to Presiding Officer Tonna
Barbara LoMoriello - Aide to Legislator Cooper
Fred Pollert - Director/Budget Review Office
Jim Spero - Deputy Director/Budget Review Office
Tom Cunningham - Chief Auditor/Budget Review Office
Sean Clancy - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Nicole DeAngelo - IR/County Executive's Office
Debra Kolyer - County Executive's Budget Office
Sal LaLima - President/Suffolk County Community College
Eric Riccioppo - Vice-President/Suffolk County Community College
Chuck Stein - Chief Financial Officer/SCCC
Paul Cooper - Suffolk County Community College
John DeMaio - Suffolk County Community College
Michael Sacca - Board of Trustees/Suffolk County Community College
Joanne Braxton - Executive Dean-Brentwood Campus/SCCC
William Connors - Executive Dean-Eastern Campus/SCCC
John Pryputniewicz - Executive Dean-Ammerman Campus/SCCC
Fritzi Rohl - Director of Human Resources/SCCC
Ellen Schuller-Mauk - President/The Faculty Association
Kevin Peterman - The Faculty Association
Joyce Gabriele - The Faculty Association
Tom Breeden - The Guild Association
Emie Endo - Newsday
Ellie Seidman-Smith - Director/Community Service Program
Toni Biscardi - American Red Cross
Kevin Broderick - American Red Cross
Janet Cappellani - American Red Cross
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 1:48 a.m.*)

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to the Education & Youth Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature. We will begin with a Pledge of Allegiance led by myself.

Salutation

We're going to begin today's meeting with a presentation by Ellie Seidman-Smith from the American Red Cross Community Service Program. I would ask all of the members of the committee to sit to my right if you want to see the screen; we put it at that angle so that the members of the audience could see it as well. So if you have any trouble seeing it, just move on over.

LEG. CRECCA:

I can see it from here.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Ellie, do we need to turn the lights off?

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

No, I don't think so. I just wanted to thank all of you. This is as of tomorrow we opened up our doors -- I know Paul was here when we opened up and it's 20 years ago and it's a momentous occasion for us.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Tomorrow is your 20 year anniversary?

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

Tomorrow is mine and Community Service's 20 Year Anniversary.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Oh, that's wonderful. I wish I had known that beforehand, we would have had a birthday cake.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

You're all invited tomorrow to Building 16 to celebrate, come have a piece of cake. So this is our Gazette, it's a little late but it came out just in time and our juvenile fact sheet and our quarterly. But to save time, since you all have an idea of what we have been doing for the last 20 years, I do want to present my staff. Three of my staff is in the audience. It's Toni Biscardi who is our Coordinator for PO Crews. Every Saturday she goes out with five vans of juveniles and because of Toni, she takes care of juveniles every Saturday. Kevin Broderick is one of the Crew Chiefs that goes out and Janet Cappellani is another Crew Chief who works with Probation Program which takes the most difficult kids who prior to going into detention -- in fact, many go in and then come back -- and Janet works with them as a Crew Chief and a Case Manager five days a week, so she has the most difficult (inaudible). So a picture is worth a thousand words and let me begin and this is our celebration of 20 years.

(*Legislator Foley entered the meeting at 1:52 p.m.*)

(*Video Presentation: 1:52 - 2:02 p.m.*)

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
That's our 20 years.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Thank you, Ellie. That was very well done.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Thank you for inviting me, Legislator Fisher.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Some of this backup material is interesting as well. I think the breakdown that there are more kids from two parent households than from single parent households, it's very interesting to see that kind of breakdown. Are there any questions for -- Ellie, can you come forward? Just before you go away, is there anybody who has a question for Ellie about this? Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
Thank you, Madam Chair. Ellie, it's good to see you. And I can vouch for the good work that the agency has done in my district and no doubt in other districts.

(*Legislator Towle entered the meeting at 2:03 p.m.*)

An issue, though, Ellie, that has come up, and it's really because of the success of the program, that there are other municipalities besides the contracted municipality -- in this case, the County -- whether they be towns or villages that I'm sure take up part of the time of your clients; is that not correct?

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Yes, it is.

LEG. FOLEY:
Do you have a breakdown -- I know you've sent us a breakdown, but whether it's in this fashion or not, as to how much time your clients spend let's say on County requests, how much on the town, how much on villages, how much in the private sector; do you have that kind of information?

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
We try to make it even so on a given week we try to do an agency that needs a cleaning or that needs food distribution like Long Island Cares or any of the soup kitchens. And then we'll go -- one day we'll go to a County project for graffiti because graffiti is a County and town agency.

LEG. FOLEY:
Right.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Then we'll try to go one day to a park or two days to a park, town,
any kind of parks that need us at the moment to do trail blazing or

cleaning. So on any given week we try to split it up so that we have
every one of the projects that we're doing even distributed.

LEG. FOLEY:
If I just may, through the Chair. One of the concerns that I have
raised in the past with you, and I think it's important to put on the
record so we can try to find a solution at some point. Many times,
not just my office but others, you know, we call up to have work done
and because of the amount of people that want you to do work,
sometimes it can take weeks if not a matter of well over a month.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Absolutely.

LEG. FOLEY:
And the point that I would just raise today, and not to make a debate
about it, but the point I would raise today is that since it really is
a contract with the County Probation Department, correct?

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Correct.

LEG. FOLEY:
All right.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Well, it's actually a County contract.

LEG. FOLEY:
All right, since it's a County contract and, you know, with all due
respect to some of the other municipalities who no doubt have work
that needs to be done, but to my way of thinking -- and I don't think
it's so much selfish but from the perspective since we are the
contractor, so to speak, and your agency is the contract agency --
that we need somehow to develop a system, whereby priority is given to
the County, just to be very blunt about it, as opposed to some other
agencies or some other municipalities who, yes, they may have work
that needs to be done but the contract is with the County. And with
the County being the contractor, so to speak -- and I mean this in all
respect and you do great work and as I said, it's an indication of how
popular your program is, if you will -- that if a County, either a
Legislator or a County agency should not have to wait a long period of

time when there are others who are not the contractors, you know, are on the list, you know, within a matter of weeks.

So it's just something that we need to discuss. We can't solve it today, but I think we need to come to grips with that particular point of it, because I know if the shoe was on the other foot there would be townships that no doubt would relegate other municipalities to the very bottom, which I'm not asking for but I think we just need to be -- I won't say more responsive but find a way that when County personnel, County agencies and Legislators, make requests that it shouldn't take four to five weeks in order to put it on the --

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
I agree.

LEG. FOLEY:
And I don't mean that as a sharp criticism, just as an observation.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
I understand that. The good news is we have been successful. The good news is that we have -- like I was saying to someone, you know, we're better than the stock market, we have never gone down, our clientele keeps on going up and up. We do -- actually to meet your demand, Brian, and I understand very well what you're saying, we will be needing some more people to go out and we need to asked the Senators for some more vans. So actually it's a shortage on our part of staff, Crew Chiefs staff and everything to meet those demands. So where there is a need we're hoping that -- where there's the demand, as you're saying, we would hope that we can supply it and this year we'll be coming back and asking for that so that we could, you know, to be able to meet all of the supplies. I think we can do that with a little bit more foresight next year. But definitely when the municipality calls us, they might give us, you know, money just for equipment and that's what we're looking for, or they might give us money for just paints or they might give us something. And that's what we go on, whatever we're given at that time we'll go on that incident, you know, on that thing. But definitely I agree with you, our priority is the County and we try to do that as well, especially 18 Legislators trying to keep their districts beautified and clean. So I appreciate your comments, Brian.

LEG. FOLEY:
Just as a quick example, what I'm really driving at is, for instance, I know other Legislators as well, if we were put on a regular schedule for different clean-ups, because I know that's difficult to do that.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:
Very difficult.

LEG. FOLEY:

And some of us have areas particularly on the more traveled either County roads or service roads that we could have clean-up efforts every three weeks. And we have tried it in my district and I know because of the amount of requests that you get that it's difficult to do it every two weeks, if not let's say even twice a summer. So the point I'm raising is in those instances, particularly on the County level where there's a need to have it done on a regular basis, at least once a month if not twice a month, let's try to find a way of doing that. If that means bumping down or moving the time for other municipalities, that just may have to be the case.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

We also have to work with mother nature as well.

LEG. FOLEY:

I understand that.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

We have the rain, we had --

LEG. FOLEY:

But absent all those things, since we are the contractor, I think that we need to have first priority, Madam Chair.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

Brian, I absolutely agree and I certainly agree with what you're saying.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Ellie, we all know the good work that you do. Thanks for coming down to remind us of how broad a program it is and for bringing your staff, we appreciate it very much. And congratulations on the 20th Anniversary.

MS. SEIDMAN-SMITH:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Are there any other cards or questions, comments? Okay, we'll go to the agenda. And we have many representatives here from the college so that if we have any questions we will ask as we get to the different items on the agenda and we will be discussing the budget after we have gone through the agenda.

INTRODUCTORY PRIME RESOLUTIONS

The first item is 1636-01 - Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with

Mechanical/Electrical upgrades at Huntington Library (CP 2105) (County Executive). And that's amending of the budget, right, that's a program that we haven't -- that we don't have on the budget.

LEG. FOLEY:

Do we need a bond with this?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Because I don't see the bond.

MR. SABATINO:

It's a bond and it's --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

There's a bond but there's not a bonding resolution.

MR. SABATINO:

Well, the bonding resolution will appear at the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

At the full -- well, we just didn't want it to happen again.

MR. SABATINO:

That's true.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

We have become nervous about that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Foley, seconded by Legislator Cooper. All in favor? Opposed? Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1637-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with the renovation/rehabilitation of water pollution control plants - College wide (CP 2109) (County Executive). Is there a motion?

LEG. FOLEY:

Just before -- motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Seconded by the Chair.

LEG. FOLEY:

On the motion. These are all -- these have been approved by the State for their customary 50% reimbursement?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
It looks like it on the --

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay. The indication from BRO is yes, okay.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Yes, okay. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?
Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1639-01 - Appropriating funds --

LEG. CARPENTER:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion by Legislator Carpenter, second by the Chair, appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Telecommunications and Information Systems - College Wide (CP 2155) (County Executive). All in favor? Opposed? 1639 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1640-01 - Amending the 2001 Operating Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with construction of a running track - Ammerman Campus (CP 2160) (County Executive). I believe we spoke about this at the last meeting. I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. FOLEY:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Seconded by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. FOLEY:
Just on the motion, Madam Chair, if we could hear from the college. Originally we had appropriations set last year I believe for \$750,000 and I believe the appropriation has been changed to 300 and change. And if we could have an explanation about the reduction, I'd appreciate it.

MR. COOPER:
The \$300,000 comes from the cost of building the eight lane track on the Western Campus and we would use the same design and we expect the same expense.

LEG. FOLEY:

But what's -- well, through the Chair, what's not included that was originally part of the larger appropriation?

MR. COOPER:

The only thing not included that you might find on a track is stadium and lighting for evening events.

LEG. FOLEY:

For seating and the like?

MR. COOPER:

Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

And why was the decision made to remove those from the project?

MR. COOPER:

Well, the college does not have a track team, we didn't anticipate major use for the track and something like that could always be added.

LEG. FOLEY:

As others -- through the Chair, as others in the audience know, part of the way we're trying to recruit and retain students at the Community College is by improving the infrastructure, not just on the Western Campus but also on the Ammerman Campus which is still the largest of the three. And part of the vision, if you will, when this was discussed years ago, was to create a track at the campus, at the Ammerman Campus, was so that it could be utilized first and foremost by the students and the surrounding community in Selden, but also to have high school events utilize -- track and field events to utilize the field, track and field as a way for the college to put its best step forward. Students and their high school students and their parents would then come on to the campus grounds and they will see it. With this reduced project -- I'll call it that, this reduced project -- will it still enable track and field events, scholastic track and field events to be held at the time campus?

MR. COOPER:

Yes. The difference is in the seating and you could not have evening events.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. You could have -- we're going to have triple jump or high jump or long jump, what will be on the inner part of -- will it just be grass on the inner part of the oval?

MR. COOPER:

The track on the West Campus has a practice soccer field on the

inside, but they have portable equipment to have triple jump, high jump, shot put, things like that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. If there are no stands, how old one -- how would you persuade a high school event to be held there if there are no stands for the parents or the teams away?

MR. COOPER:

Well, as I said, that could be added to the project --

LEG. FOLEY:

It could be added to it?

MR. COOPER:

-- be it second phase.

LEG. FOLEY:

The design of the project wouldn't prevent that from --

MR. COOPER:

Correct.

LEG. FOLEY:

It wouldn't be placed in an area of the campus that you couldn't have room?

MR. COOPER:

Yeah, we would design it anticipating future expansion.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay, there has been a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? 1640 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1641-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with Life Safety Alterations and Fire Alarm Upgrades - College Wide (CP 2167) (County Executive).

LEG. COOPER:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Motion by Legislator Cooper, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? 1641 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1642-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with Asbestos Removal (Phase III) - College Wide (CP 2168) (County Executive). Is there a motion?

LEG. CRECCA:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion to approve by Legislator Crecca, seconded by Legislator Cooper. Too many C's on this committee. Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1643-01 - amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to Electrical Distribution Systems - College Wide (CP 2179) (County Executive). Is there a motion?

LEG. FOLEY:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion by Legislator Foley, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? 1643 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1644 should not be on the agenda, if I understand.

MR. SABATINO:
It was adopted by a CN.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay. 1645-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with Site Improvements - Ammerman Campus (CP 2200) (County Executive).

LEG. FOLEY:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion by Legislator Foley, seconded by Legislator Cooper. All in favor? Opposed? Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1646-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Mechanical Systems - College Wide (CP 2206) (County Executive).

LEG. TOWLE:
Motion.

LEG. FOLEY:
Second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion by Legislator Towle, seconded by Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
On the motion?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes, thank you. Mr. Cooper, as you know, there have been some air quality issues at the Riverhead building on the -- Southampton Riverhead Building on the Ammerman Campus, perhaps even both. Could you tell the committee where things stands with the air quality improvements slated for college wide but let's just focus for a moment on the Ammerman Campus.

MR. COOPER:

Well, the largest problem is the Huntington Library which is a separate project that you just approved.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. COOPER:

This project covers the remaining buildings and largely it's for the Ammerman Campus.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. We have made some mechanical improvements already, have we not, to some buildings on Ammerman?

MR. COOPER:

Yes. We have added air-conditioning to isolated areas and we have done some boiler replacements.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. With this appropriation of dollars, do you see an elimination of the air quality problems or is it just simply to mitigate some of the problems? Because I know there are some interior rooms, particularly in some of the classroom buildings that have had some chronic problems, and how would this resolution address that?

MR. COOPER:

Well, this would definitely reduce the number of air quality problems, it would increase ventilation and it would clean the duct work and it would boost the fan power. But it would not fully air-condition every building, so you would still have high humidity on some circumstances and you would probably have some degree of indoor air quality problems.

LEG. FOLEY:

Would you -- through the Chair, would you bring in more outside air, more fresh air into the interior parts of some of the larger buildings?

MR. COOPER:

Current codes call for substantially more outdoor air than the codes at the time the building was constructed.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right, so there will be a large amount of new air coming into the

building?

MR. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
And an exhaust building as well?

MR. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
It won't be recircled?

MR. COOPER:
No, outdoor air, fresh air.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay, all right. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
When we vote on resolutions for mechanical upgrades, generally when you list them for libraries, is that listed separately? Because I see that there are two separate resolutions, one for the Huntington Library and one for College-Wide.

MR. COOPER:
The Huntington Library needs the most work and is in the most critical condition and has a separate project.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay, thank you. Can you tell me what RPZ valves are?

MR. COOPER:
RPZ is an acronym for Reduced Pressure Zone, it's a device to prevent water from flowing backwards in a pipe. It became mandated by municipalities when a water main failed that fed an athletic field and it caused the reduced pressure and irrigation system, water from the field which had cecticide in it was drawn into the municipal water supply, and this prevents that kind of problem.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay, that's the subject of our next resolution. Oh, there was a motion and a second but I don't think I took the vote, did I?

MS. MAHONEY: `
No.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? 1646 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1648-01, motion by the Chair, seconded by Legislator Cooper, and that's appropriating funds in connection with the installation of RPZ Valves (CP 2301) (County Executive) All in favor? Opposed? 1648 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

LEG. FOLEY:

Madam Chair, before we move on to other resolutions.

12

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

And since the engineer's are here from the Community College, just as a quick follow-up to all the resolutions that we just approved. How many of these projects did we have to increase the funding because of a number of issues that we've spoken about, Madam Chair, in the Public Works Committee of how some of these projects, while the County was ready to move on them, so to speak, four years ago, three to four years ago, the State Dormitory Authority wasn't ready to issue the bonds and we had to wait quite a bit of time. So how many of the projects that we've just approved have we had to change the scope of the work to fit the original number, or did we increase the number, increase the dollar amount in order to meet the original need to -- original scope of the project?

MR. COOPER:

There are six projects in total that required additional funding, but none of them have come up yet.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. COOPER:

Some of the ones that are covered in -- the next two resolutions are ones where we increase funding.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. When we get to those -- through the Chair, when we get to those -- well, it's prime in Public Works, it will be, I think, to use the term instructive to the committee to know what the difference in bonding -- difference in cost, okay? Thank you, Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay, and we will come to those.

INTRODUCTORY NON-PRIME RESOLUTIONS

1638-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with renovations to Sagtikos Theatre - Western Campus (CP 2115) (County Executive).

LEG. CARPENTER:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion by Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. FOLEY:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Seconded by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? 1638 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

13

LEG. FOLEY:
Madam Chair, if could we hear from --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Did you want to work with these two together?

LEG. FOLEY:
Whichever, okay.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
1647-01 - Appropriating funds in connection with renovation of Babylon Student Center - Ammerman Campus (CP 2207) (County Executive).

LEG. FOLEY:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Motion by Legislator Foley, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? 1647 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0). And Legislator Foley has questions about these.

LEG. FOLEY:
Thank you, Madam Chair, for your patience.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Now, these two are not amending resolutions, they're appropriating.

LEG. FOLEY:
They're appropriating. The point that we've raised at Public Works over a period of time is that many of these projects date back four years. So the concerns that many of us had was that the numbers could be stale, so to speak, and you either have to scale down the size of

the project in order to meet the original number or increase the budget in order to meet the original purpose of the appropriation a number of years ago. So if we could hear from you, Mr. Cooper, on that.

MR. COOPER:

Yes. Renovation to Sagtikos Theatre was increased by \$200,000 for exactly the reason you mentioned, and the renovation to the Babylon Student Center was increased by \$800,000.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Wow. Eight hundred thousand dollars because of the delay in the project?

MR. COOPER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Just let the record reflect, the delay was not on the County's part. Four years ago we put together a 40 million plus maintenance budget, Capital Budget, to repair and reconstruct buildings throughout the

campuses. Because the Ammerman has the most amount of buildings and some of the oldest buildings, that was the campus that was to receive the largest portion of those monies. So we were ready four years, Madam Chair, to move forward with this. The State Legislature also was ready, they had put the monies in the budget, but the Dormitory Authority couldn't issue the bonds because they were directed by the Governor's Budget Office not to do so. And this was a problem not just here in this County but it was a Statewide problem and now we're seeing the results of that delay. While I'm happy we're moving forward with the projects, the record should reflect that some of these are costs that could have been avoided if they were -- if bonds were issued in a timely fashion as they usually are but they weren't in this case.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

And their costs which result in economic burdens not only to the County but to the State as well because --

LEG. FOLEY:

It increases their share, too.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

-- they have reimbursement so it increases their share as well.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Thank you for pointing that out, Legislator Foley.

TABLED SENSE RESOLUTIONS

Sense 36-2001 - Memorializing Resolution requesting the State of New York to appeal school aid decision (Caracciolo).

LEG. CRECCA:

Can I get an explanation on that?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Can we get an explanation?

LEG. CRECCA:

Motion to approve for the purposes --

LEG. TOWLE:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

There's a motion to approve by Legislator Crecca, seconded by Legislator Towle. Explanation?

MR. SABATINO:

This relates to that New York City State Supreme Court decision which struck the formula for aid to schools. There's a question as to whether it's going to be appealed or not and Legislator Caracciolo had filed the bill asking that the Governor do, in fact, appeal it because

it impacts how State aid is going to be distributed to school districts.

LEG. CRECCA:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. There is a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? I'm opposed. The Sense Resolution is approved (VOTE: 5-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Fisher).

Sense 50-2001 - Memorializing Resolution requesting State of New York to expand unemployment benefits to nonprofessional employees of educational institutions (Towle). Motion, Legislator Towle?

LEG. TOWLE:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Second?

LEG. CRECCA:
I will second it.

LEG. FOLEY:
Explanation.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Seconded by Legislator Crecca. Explanation, Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:
There's a pending Senate/Assembly Bill which would modify a portion of the New York Labor Law which currently states that if you are someone working for a school who's a non-professional employee and you're eligible for unemployment compensation, apparently there's some kind of a quirk in the law which doesn't allow the payments to be made when school is out of session; this would allow those payments to be made during that period.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
A further question to that. If someone is a ten month contract, would they then receive unemployment during the summer, is that what this refers to; ten month employees would receive unemployment during the summer?

MR. SABATINO:
If the repeal were to go through, right.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Were there cases, Legislator Towle, that you were considering?

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes. Actually, Legislator Fisher, I received at least 10 or 15 letters from employees within the William Floyd and Center Moriches School District pointing out, you know, this deficiency as far as they were concerned and as far as I was concerned. And obviously in

checking with Counsel, I learned of the Senate and Assembly bills and have since prepared to support that effort.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay, thank you. There's a motion and a second. All in favor?
Opposed? Sense 50 is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0). And that comes to the end of our agenda.

Now, discussion of the Suffolk Community College budget. Chuck, can you come join us and Budget Review is up here. President LaLima, would you like to join us and Mr. Sacca? Good afternoon.

MR. LA LIMA:
Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Would you like to make some comments before we begin to ask questions about the budget as we go through the Budget Review analysis and the County Executive's Recommended Budget?

MR. LA LIMA:
I'd be happy to. First let me start by saying that our College Board of Trustees went through a painstaking process in reviewing the needs of the college for next year. And after a considerable amount of discussion, possibly debate on issues, a budget that complied with the 4% cap requirement was approved and which was forwarded on to the County Executive's Office. That budget, of course, was considered by the majority of the college to be a very, very bare bones type budget, to the extent that all three campuses have governance bodies that passed a common resolution urging the board to in the future seek a full needs budget as opposed to a very bare bones cost-to-continue budget. So that's a concern for all of us, including our board.

I think we all recognize that the mandates that the college has to fund through its budget exceeds a 4% increase in County funding. Added to that, of course, are the problems that we are facing throughout the State without a State budget in place and not knowing where we will land with respect to the support with the State. So there are many concerns for us at the college. But even with the State coming through at some point, a share that let's say is hopeful on our part but we don't think it will reach that level of \$125 per FTE, we would still be facing significant problems with respect to the 4% side from the County because the mandates on the County side exceed that 4.% the health insurance, for example, there's a very significant increase in cost and there are some other associated mandates that we will have to absorb within that budget. And they in the aggregate exceed the 4% contribution increase that the County would be making in the proposed budget from the County Executive.

So those are some of the issues. There's always ways to squeeze. You know, you can get down to a body that's barely living and still have some blood to squeeze out of it, so there's ways to do it.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
A very morbid metaphor.

MR. LA LIMA:
It's very morbid and it perhaps reflects I think the mood that many of us share at the college because it's a very difficult time. And we also recognize it's a difficult time for the County because we know

the economy is not doing well throughout the country and has its impact locally, so we understand all those issues. But, you know, we do feel the college has had a very difficult time in the past several years because the budgets have been tight year to year to year and consequently, in an economically difficult time it becomes even more pronounced. I think we all saw that at some point the days of wine and roses in the economy were going to come to an end but yet we were getting only the 4% in the last few years. So it's a time now where that's going to become magnified in terms of the difficulty we face in trying to operate the college, at least in terms of what we would like to see as a full needs situation.

So in a very broad sense, that's the comments that I would like to make, and I'm not sure, the Chairman might wish to make some. And then details, I think my financial officer, Mr. Stein, probably could respond to much more accurately than I might be able to.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Thank you, President LaLima. Mr. Sacca, did you want to make some comments?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Thank you, Ms. Chairman. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Certainly.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

I further support the President's comments regarding the college budget. The one comment I would like to make is that when we did submit in the budget, the budget was submitted with the cognizant that we were very concerned concerning any other expenditures such as various contracts out there -- looking at the AME contract, faculty contracts or additional impact to the college associated with insurance and others -- that this budget that we submitted did not reflect any of those expenditures. My understanding is that the AME contract is going to be coming before the Legislators next Tuesday and I would suggest that we can take a look, a hard look at that to see if that is a going to be a financial impact because of it. If, in fact, other contracts are going to be concluded, my suggestion is that there should be funding addressed if, in fact, those contracts are going to be concluded.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

There's one other concern that I do have and that's a concern regarding a safety net for the college. With the depletion of the Reserve Fund, there is no longer going to be a safety net.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

But the contracts weren't included when you drew up the budget. It just -- why?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Why was not the contracts included?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

You knew that there were contracts in negotiation and it's perplexing why they weren't included.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Well, it's very difficult to include something that has not been concluded as far as a contract, we don't know. And if we put in dollars associated with it, you know, just how much dollars do we put in there? We don't know what the settlements are going to be, we don't know when they're going to be settled. And I think it would not be prudent for us to guess --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

I can understand on a negotiating -- from a negotiating point of view that you wouldn't want to create the allusion of having deeper pockets than you have. My question is wouldn't there be some cushion provided knowing that there is going to be a contract and that perhaps there could have been some allowance made at that point?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Well, what we looked at was to identify the problem when we submitted in the budget and we considered that a course of action. So that if we identified it when we submitted it in, everyone was cognizant to the fact that we addressed it but we did not put any dollars in there.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

But this is what's now depleting the reserve funds in part, is it not?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Well, my understanding with the Reserve Fund is that we wanted to transfer funds in order to cover the budget so that we would be within compliance of State law. If, in fact, we cannot transfer those funds until such time as the State budget is concluded, then my understanding is that we're not in compliance.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. And Chuck, I know you're shaking your head because when I looked back at the budget it's saying it's because of FTE, the FTE's not coming in with the amount of increase that we had hoped and we would have to go into the reserve funds because of that.

MR. STEIN:

The reserve funds were being used in contemplation of a State increase in FTE aid.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Uh-huh.

MR. STEIN:

The instructions that were given to the college in preparing the budget included the fact that unless the Governor included an increase in his budget that he submitted to the Legislature, the State Legislature, that we not include anything for State aid. So therefore, there was no alternative but to include that amount from the reserve funds pending some resolve at the State level. And --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Chuck, what is the Governor's recommendation?

MR. STEIN:

Zero, no increase.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

No increase at all?

MR. STEIN:

No increase, which is typical regardless of who the Governor is, I think going back many years; the Executive at the State level leaves that up to the State Legislature to provide some increases.

With respect to the inclusion of any potential settlement in the proposed budget, that's not usually in accordance with the requirements from the County Exec's Office in preparing the budget. If there is no contract settlement we don't include an amount and that's why it came across that way. And as a matter of fact, that was so stated in the resolution that the board passed in adopting the budget.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

What -- Mr. Sacca, were you finished? I interrupted you, I'm sorry.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Chuck, may I ask you a question about student enrollment, because there is a question in BRO's analysis on pages five and six. Here BRO has stated that your estimations are overstated on the amount of student enrollment and, therefore, student tuition. What is your enrollment in the summer, what does -- how has it been; has it improved, has it gone up?

MR. STEIN:

The summer enrollment is up slightly over last summer.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay.

MR. STEIN:

And I don't have the exact numbers from Institutional Research, but I know the summer is up a bit.

20

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

And what does that do with your total numbers, does it remain as high as the year before, are the numbers lower; where are your numbers now for the 2000-2001 year, academic year?

MR. STEIN:

The 2000-2001 year as compared to 1999-2000, we think we are slightly above what we had in 1999-2000. The budget that was adopted for 2000-2001 included an anticipated 1% growth. We believe we're above last year and once we have the final numbers from the summer I'll know where we stand in terms of the whole year.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. Let me just get to my next question.

MR. STEIN:

That's for our -- I want to clarify that.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

That's your total.

MR. STEIN:

That's for our total FTE's.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Right.

MR. STEIN:

It's important to point out that the growth spurt occurred in our State aidable courses that are more non-traditional courses, so that's where we're actually picking up the FTE's.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay.

MR. STEIN:

Like in our ESL area.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. Were there any other questions about the FTE numbers? Okay.

Chuck, I have a question about, again, in the BRO analysis on page ten regarding revenues from the Field House. BRO states here that their

numbers for revenues are \$67,200 more than the \$496,800 included in the proposed budget.

MR. STEIN:
That's from --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Are there other bookings besides this that we could add to the revenues?

MR. STEIN:
Well, I think the thing that's important to point out is that those numbers are represented by deposits that have been taken. And until

such time as the event occurs, to be more conservative you don't want to count it because technically the event could be canceled, we get to keep the deposit but we'll lose the full --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
The full revenue.

MR. STEIN:
Full revenue. So I would, you know, hesitate to just jump in and grab at those things until such time as an event occurs.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay. Would you be able to give us some idea as to anticipated revenues, not hard numbers that you are counting on but projections and anticipation?

MR. STEIN:
Well, the total projection for the Field House, if you will, for the sports complex I think was somewhere in the vicinity of 1.4 million for next year, and that was with the anticipated bookings, with anticipated revenues from various sources including advertising that would go on there.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay. We have -- I have a number here of one and a half million, a little more than one and a half million, okay. But we'll have to look back at that to see how we can tighten that up better so that the numbers are closer, but I understand what you're saying where you anticipate revenues but they're not guaranteed.

MR. STEIN:
I mean the County passes a budget anticipating sales tax revenue and sometimes it doesn't occur.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
On page eleven of BRO's report, BRO indicates that the college can

expect to collect \$890,370 in out-of-County tuition or 287,599 -- \$287,599 more than what was included in the adopted budget; maybe between you and BRO you can explain why there's such a big difference, that's a lot of money.

MR. STEIN:

Are we talking about this year or next year?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Current, this year.

MR. STEIN:

The current year. One of the things that we've done is we've been aggressively pursuing out-of-County payments, especially through the Police Academy, for recruits that come from outside of Suffolk. My interpretation, they're students and they're from outside of Suffolk and, therefore, their host County should be -- their home County, just like with any other student, should be billed and we've been billing.

22

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. So then you're agreeing with BRO that the numbers should be higher than how it appeared in the proposed budget? Budget Review, this was in the current year, yes?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Yes, I'm read this correctly and the number should be almost \$300,000 higher.

MR. STEIN:

Well, I think we're both saying the same thing in terms of the current year.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Fred, it didn't seem to me that you were saying the same thing. It seemed to me that they were saying 890,000 and you were saying over a million. So then we can fix that line; in other words, we can add \$300,000 more to the revenue, Fred?

MR. POLLERT:

Over the two years we believe that our estimate is proper and correct. So what we -- if you read the narrative, we believe that there is additional revenue this year but that the revenue will be down slightly next year.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

By 113,000.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. So it would be 150,000, \$160,000 more. Okay, I'm just trying to find a way to see where we can locate monies in this budget so that we can try to preserve what's in the reserve account to accommodate our contracts that are coming up and try to have a budget that look reasonable. And I see someone grimacing as he faces me and that person is from Budget Review.

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, just on that point, Madam Chair. It says, "Therefore, BRO recommends that the proposed revenue from out-of-County tuition chargebacks be increased to" -- if we read the next sentence, "To 979,407 or \$202,736 more than what is provided for in the proposed budget."

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

So we're looking to make that particular amendment --

MR. STEIN:

I think the difference --

LEG. FOLEY:

-- to the proposed budget?

MR. STEIN:

-- lies in what the anticipated class size is for the Police Academy. And I believe that the Budget Review Office, and certainly they can speak for themselves, but I believe that what they were anticipating was a similar class size next year as to what occurred this year, and the indications that we were getting were that the class size would be somewhat smaller next year than this year.

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, how much smaller? Are we talking about a factor of ten, a factor of five, a factor of hundred; is it 202,000 less or 10,000 less?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Well, actually, Budget Review, in your narrative in another portion of this analysis you do make reference to the Police Academy and that

your anticipated numbers are higher than what the college has anticipated.

MR. POLLERT:
What the confusion --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Is this what makes the difference here as well?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay.

MR. POLLERT:
What the confusion is is that the Police Department did a cost analysis and they believe that it is less expensive to put through a number of smaller classes as opposed to one large class. So it's the intent of the Police Department to have a number of smaller classes reducing the class size but the total number of cadets going through the academy would remain the same. So perhaps the Community College had heard that they were having smaller classes, but they're going to have more classes during the year.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay. There's a question that I have regarding some narrative on page 13. "Now, BRO estimates a surplus of approximately \$1 million in permanent salaries for 2001-2002 based on the currently filled positions. Much of this surplus is to be found in the Instructional Budget." Okay. And you're in agreement with the County Exec with those numbers, aren't you?

MR. POLLERT:
The forecast is based upon the number of currently filled titles within the Community College, they have a number of vacancies. So if you take the number of currently filled titles and you compare it to the available salaries, there will be a surplus of a million dollars, assuming the Community College does not go out to fill any of those vacancies. It's our understanding that the Community College does intend to fill some of those vacancies. And I believe on the following page we indicate that the turnover savings has been set so that it's equivalent to maintaining roughly 30 vacancies for the entire year to be able to achieve the turnover savings, that's at the top of page 15. So 29 of the 64 spots would have to remain vacant for the entire year to achieve the turnover level. So the \$1 million is a potential savings if they didn't have any hiring whatsoever, but clearly the college intends to fill several of those vacancies.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

But those 64 vacant positions are not all instructional positions, they're a variety of positions.

MR. POLLERT:

That is correct, yes.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay.

MR. STEIN:

We have requested a \$1.5 million -- round numbers, \$1.5 million turnover savings level. Based upon the positions that were vacant at the time we submitted the budget and we identified ten positions that were going to be filled, including the instructors positions, Dean of Faculty, Dean of Enrollment Services, Senior Safety Officer, off the top of my head, there were ten positions. Also, there were requirements subsequent to the budget being submitted and it's anticipated that those positions will be filled; it was anticipated that they were filled when we submitted the budget, so it's anticipated that they'll be filled as we go into next year. So I am not quite sure that there will be this million dollars that was cited.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Surplus.

MR. STEIN:

And in fact, if we don't fill especially the faculty positions, then we're going to see the impact on the adjunct and overload line. So it's --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. I'm just going through the analysis. Does anyone else have any questions about this? Legislator Foley, why don't you ask a couple of questions while I go through here and find my other questions.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. There's a series of questions throughout the proposed budget, but since we're on the topic of the personnel services, why don't we -- personal services rather, why don't we just

focus on that for a moment and then we'll get to some other areas of the budget later in the committee meeting.

Mr. Stein, you just mentioned that out of the 73 vacancies, or if the President or the Chair wishes to respond, of the 73 vacancies the college intends to fill ten of those 73; is that what we're to understand?

MR. STEIN:

Of the vacancies that were in existence at the time that the budget was submitted.

LEG. FOLEY:

Which is how many; which was 64 vacancies then?

MR. STEIN:

I think it was 60, something like that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay, right. Okay, of the 64 you intend to fill ten; is that correct?

MR. STEIN:

Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. Now of that ten, there are 12 Assistant Professor positions; now that 12, does that include the five that were not hired this year of the 21 that we had placed?

MR. STEIN:

They would be filled.

LEG. FOLEY:

Those five would --

MR. STEIN:

The budget anticipates that they will be filled.

LEG. FOLEY:

Those five will be filled.

MR. STEIN:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Is that five included in the 12 that are vacant under Assistant Professors, or is it 12 plus five? Look at page 13 of the Budget Review Office analysis, it mentions that there are 12 Assistant Professor positions that are vacant.

MR. STEIN:

I would make the assumption that it's included.

LEG. FOLEY:

It is included.

MR. STEIN:

Yeah.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. So of the 12 Assistant Professor positions, how many of the ten that you're going to fill campus wide, how many of that ten are Assistant Professors, is it five, is it seven, is it six?

MR. STEIN:

Five.

LEG. FOLEY:

Five of the 12.

MR. STEIN:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

The other 12 will remain --

MR. STEIN:

The other seven.

LEG. FOLEY:

Seven will remain vacant, okay. Now, by filling the ten positions, if in fact you agree with the Budget Review Office's analysis, which as the Chair had mentioned, of the currently filled positions there's \$1 million surplus monies if all of the positions remain vacant. So since there's now a decision made by the college that they intend to fill 10 of the 64, how much less of that million would be available as going to the -- say as surplus monies?

MR. STEIN:

I guess from the financial perspective I don't see this million, as I mentioned.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. All right, just on that point if I may. And I under -- Budget Review -- through the Chair, we have heard from the college that they don't see this particular number, could you just tell us how you arrived at that number? And given what we have heard that there's the intention of the college to fill ten positions, I know we don't have the salaries in front of us, but I think what's important for this committee to know and the full body before we vote on this, because this is an important area of the budget, that there is this kind of surplus which could be used for a variety of purposes. If ten positions are going to be filled and the remaining will remain vacant, how much money will be left in the permanent salary account as surplus?

MR. POLLERT:

What the methodology of the Budget Review Office is we did a download from the Payroll Personnel System of all the current employees at the Community College. We then provided what the step increases that are currently called for underneath the current contract to all the individuals and we priced out what the cost was on a per person cost

for both the AME as well as the faculty contracts and we came up with a total surplus of approximately \$1 million in the salary accounts. So we did a detailed cost breakout.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay.

MR. STEIN:
If I might.

LEG. FOLEY:
Please, through the Chair.

MR. STEIN:
I just want to reiterate what I said a few moments ago. That at the time the budget was submitted by the college, which was in April, we said that of the vacancies, ten positions would be filled.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay.

MR. STEIN:
Subsequent to the budget being submitted, additional vacancies came through retirements, resignations, etcetera; it's the college's intention that those vacancies will be filled.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay. Now on --

MR. STEIN:
So I think that's where the difference is.

LEG. FOLEY:
Well, on that basis, Fred, how would that -- through the Chair, how would that change these calculations? I know you can't give it to us by the penny, but if there are retirements that have taken place and the college intends to fill those positions, they were filled at the time that the budget was proposed to us, was proposed to the County Executive -- I knew you can't give us an exact amount of money, I know there's payouts that need to be made when one retires -- do you have that information available, would you need it from the college as to how many have retired and what the payout would be for their retirement, the sick and vacation time; would you need that information from the college?

MR. STEIN:
It actually comes from the County.

LEG. FOLEY:
I understand that. How many positions are those? How many retirements were there?

MR. STEIN:
I don't have the exact number.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. Just through the Chair, if we can't get it today -- this is a very important point, Madam Chair. If we can't get that number today, if we can get it as soon as it's practical. And I'm sure you must have that also -- as to those who have retired at the end of the academic year, what that impact is upon, you know, the closeout of this particular budget year. Because not only -- what, there's sick and vacation time that has to be paid out; is that correct?

MR. STEIN:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Fred, you'd need that information?

MR. POLLERT:

I believe that we get the data from the Department of Audit and Control.

LEG. FOLEY:

As to what date did you have that data, July, June? So it would include those very positions?

MR. POLLERT:

Probably in the last month or so we got the data through the last month.

LEG. FOLEY:

So would that then question the concern raised by Mr. Stein? That those who have retired and those positions will be filled that may not have been included in this million dollar figure?

MR. POLLERT:

No, that would not deal with Mr. Stein's concern. What his concern is is that we took a snapshot in time what the current staffing levels were.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right.

MR. POLLERT:

He intends to fill not just the ten but in addition to that he intends to fill the number of retirees that had retired between the time they turned in their budget request.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right. So if we can have that -- if you could furnish that to BRO,

those positions that were retire -- retirements were made and you intend to fill them, because that's going to impact the bottom line figure.

Madam Chair, if I just may just on that point, again, on personal services.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

What page are you on?

29

LEG. FOLEY:

Page 12, if we could just hear from the college on this particular point. In the first paragraph it states that there's a shortfall in the Permanent Salary Account for all adopted funding levels. "The shortfall is primarily due to the 384,000, 11% over expenditure of the General Administration appropriation." Now, number one -- and these are a series of questions that we need to ask and I'm sure the college understands that. The first question is why is there an over expenditure, number one? And number two, what position within General Administration did you -- did these over expenditures occur in; were they the creation of new positions, were they changes in salaries?

MR. STEIN:

There were a number of issues. Number one, there were some line positions included in 2270 which is General Administration which didn't belong there. First of all, there was a duplicate position of Legal Affairs and Compliance Officer. There's a duplicating machine operator position shown in General Administration which really belongs in an another area, 2280. There's a Clerk Typist that belongs in student services which is in 2250, not in General Administration.

In addition to that, during the year the position of Executive Dean at the Eastern Campus was filled by someone at the college and what was reflected in the budget was the entry-level salary, the person who took the job is above entry-level so that created additional cost. We have a series of upgrades as a result of Civil Service requirements which added an additional cost. And there were some appointments that occurred after the budget was submitted last year but before the budget was approved. There was the Business Officer at the Ammerman Campus who was hired in June but it was never reflected in the budget that was submitted to the Legislature or, in fact, corrected by the Legislature.

LEG. FOLEY:

So you disagree -- so to cut to the chase, you disagree with the amount of the over expenditure.

MR. STEIN:

There were no new positions, no -- I think what you're looking for is whether or not there are a whole host of appointments in General

Administration.

LEG. FOLEY:

When you look at page 12, it states that there's an over expenditure of 384,000 in General Administration appropriations.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

I'm hearing that --

MR. STEIN:

In addition to what I just said, if I might.

LEG. FOLEY:

Is it correct or not correct?

30

MR. STEIN:

In addition to what I said, there was also an increase, when the budget was submitted to the Legislature by the Executive, there was an increase in turnover savings and then there was an additional increase by the Legislature in turnover savings. There was also a removal of \$50,000 in the permanent salary line theoretically so that there wouldn't be a payment as a result of study that was done, even though there was no money put into the budget for that study, but 50,000 was taken out.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. So what you're saying is that the 11% over expenditure, you've mentioned a variety of reasons why that occurred, is that what you're saying, and not necessarily that it was just new hirings. That's what I'm hearing here, Brian, that it just seems to be a variety of reasons, appointments, upgrades due to Civil Service positions. Chuck, is that what you are saying?

MR. STEIN:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

I have a question about another area. Legislator Foley, I will just ask some questions and then we will go back to you.

LEG. FOLEY:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

On pages -- again, back to the BRO report, fees for services-non employees, that chart on pages 19 and 20. In academic support --

MS. MAHONEY:

I can't hear you, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

I'm sorry, my mike was off, that's why you can't hear me. In academic support, the recommended budget line -- I know it's not a lot of money but I'm seeing there in academic support there's almost a 50% cut from the requested to recommended budget, but I don't see any such cut in, again, General Administration. Now, it would seem to me that --

MR. STEIN:

We didn't.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

-- I would prefer to see those academic -- you didn't, I'm talking about the recommended budget, okay. And I'm not agreeing with where the cut was, that I would rather cut the \$20,000 out of General Administration and not from staff development which is on the STAR Program, right?

MR. STEIN:

Some of the costs associated with General Administration are fixed not even by the college, for example, the audit fees.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

What about the consultants for business office student information systems?

MR. STEIN:

Well, that would probably be an area where it would come from which means we can't proceed to improve the programs for the students in terms of registering on-line and paying, etcetera; that's what that was all about.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

I'm just curious about that \$20,000 that was taken from that STAR which it sounds to me -- now, I'm not that familiar with the program -- that that would be a staff improvement program.

MR. STEIN:

I agree.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. And if you are talking about distance learning, then you want more staff that's been trained in the use of technology.

MR. STEIN:

We would be --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

So I thought that would be a crucial area to keep that \$20,000.

MR. STEIN:

We would be very supportive --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Even if it's cutting this a little bit.

MR. STEIN:

We would be very supportive if the Legislature saw fit to restore that money.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

But to take it from this line, from the 467?

MR. STEIN:

Well, I would hope that you could restore it.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. It's just -- you know, I think we need to look at some of the recommendations from the County Executive and your reactions to them and where you might see that it might be a better place to take that money from.

MR. STEIN:

I think it's the administration and certainly the board is here represented by its Chair and the President is here and, you know, they can certainly speak to the commitment to staff development and staff training. I deal with the numbers.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Uh-huh. Okay.

MR. STEIN:

But I think that the commitment is there to do that.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. All right. So I'm just asking you to take a look at those lines there within that chart and give me your impressions on that. Mr. Sacca or President LaLima, you see the chart to which I'm referring --

MR. LA LIMA:

Yeah

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

-- which is on fees for services, non-employees. We have consulting fees under the General Administration title which come to \$255,000 and those were recommended by the County Exec to be fully -- to fully

finance the request by the college. But in Academic Support which I think seems to be very important, the STAR Program, Distance Education Training, technical support which would be staff development, that's cut by 50% and I was wondering what your reaction was to that

MR. LA LIMA:

Well, obviously it's a concern. On the scale of the whole budget, that's a small amount of money, obviously.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

It's a very small amount of money. But if you are going to be attracting out-of-County students through the distance learning, then wouldn't it be very important to have staff that knows how to use the technology?

MR. LA LIMA:

Uh-huh, absolutely. You know, once we get a budget, and we have no idea at this time what our budget is going to end up being, we once again have to go through the numbers and the priorities of the college and make adjustments.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Uh-huh.

MR. LA LIMA:

Because obviously there are priorities that may not appear in the budget to be adequately funded that we're going to have to address in some other way. So there's going to have to be, you know, a review again, and certainly this would be, you know, one of a number of priorities that we would have to look at.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

But because we do have a time situation here before we have to submit amendments to the budget in a timely manner, I'm asking to you -- I'm pointing at areas that jump out at me and therefore I'm asking you to think about these, okay, because we can't -- we want to know what you want. You asked for a 4% -- you know, you presented a 4% budget here.

MR. LA LIMA:

We had to.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

And will that -- will the 4% budget that you have presented to the County Executive satisfy the needs of the college?

MR. LA LIMA:

No.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

No.

MR. LA LIMA:

No, we know that.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

So then the 4% budget isn't really what you were requesting, I mean, it's what you drew together but it wasn't the real, actual request that you need to satisfy the academic needs of the college.

MR. LA LIMA:

It's not a real needs budget. I think even in the resolution the board adopted, just the fact that they pointed out that any settlement, particularly with AME which was imminent at that time but not yet over, you know, was not funded --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

It wasn't reflected.

MR. LA LIMA:

-- in terms of our budget planning. Now, could you take money out of other places to fund it? Well, yeah, as I pointed out before, there's always places to drain a little more until there's no more life. But you know, I think that's the kind of problem we're facing, there's this 4% issue that we have to deal with; on the other hand, you know, where does it come from? Well, it's like a camel, if you cross the desert long enough even a camel loses weight, that big bump on their back is going to gradually shrink. And that's basically what's happening, the bump on the back is shrinking.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Well, it's better than your previous metaphor.

MR. LA LIMA:

My mood is improving. But I think that -- just as a last comment and I'll turn this over in just a second. Certainly this side we would address, we would approve or go along with such funding moves.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Madam Chairman, I respectfully request if I can submit the resolution of the board for your perusal and the rest of the Legislators' perusal. And if you look at this, this was adopted on April the 6th, so it will give you some perspective in time, when we looked at this

budget, what we were looking at and the alternatives associated with submitting the budget in. And may I submit this in and can you have it copied for me?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Sure.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Thank you. Elizabeth? Okay, Legislator Crecca has a question. Chuck, did you want to say something?

LEG. CRECCA:

Go ahead, Chuck.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Go ahead.

MR. STEIN:

I just want to, again, from a financial standpoint. The budget that came over was a budget that was going to be very difficult to live with, I said so at the board meeting on April 6th. When the Executive's Office, the Executive Budget Office reviewed it and submitted it to the Legislature, approximately \$750,000 was moved from areas that were already too low in order to theoretically cover the AME contract. Well, it's not enough, even the Budget Review Office Report says that it's not enough to cover the AME contract. But we have also lost \$750,000 from areas that couldn't afford to lose anything to begin with. So I'll again state that the budget that's before you now is going to be extremely difficult to live with in terms of operations next year.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

And the comment that I just made was that you presented us with a bare bones budget in April as well and so, you know, we all have to acknowledge that. And what we're trying to do is find a way to have a budget that will be easier to live with and discuss this.

I wanted to get to advertising, there were some questions -- but before we get to that, I have a question for Budget Review. Let me just -- sorry. It was about personnel. On page 12, Budget Review -- no, it wasn't page 12.

LEG. CRECCA:

You want me to ask my question?

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Yes, you ask your question first. I'm sorry.

LEG. CRECCA:

And it really goes to anybody there. I guess I'm looking at it, we only got all the reports and all on Friday, so I apologize for not being fully informed. One of the trends we're seeing, and I think Budget Review sort of highlights it in their report, is that each year

the County's portion of contribution is -- and I don't mean just rising in the sense of dollars, but percentage wise we're rising.

Basically, if you are looking at page seven of BRO's report, if we go ahead with the increase as proposed this year, we're looking that we've raised our annual contribution to the college about 50% over the last six years. You're talking -- and what I see is, if you compare us with other community colleges, we're representing about 30% of the college revenue source as opposed to a Statewide average of 22%. And I'm not saying we have to match ourselves to the State, but the tendency seems to be if you look at recent years is increased spending, increased spending, increased spending, but it's not -- we're not seeing a State aid increase of the same percentages, we're not seeing a tuition increase of the same expenditures. So what we have is that we keep getting more and more of the burden.

And I guess my other concern is -- and I'll ask you to address both because they sort of go along with each other -- is we're saying we're within the 4% cap, but the truth of the matter is is that we're looking at what I guess is about a 6.7 % increase in spending, that's because we're pulling money out of the Reserve Fund. What we're doing is we're taking away I think the safety net. My concern here is that, look, I want to fund the college, I want to fund it so that it remains a strong college and continues to grow, but I don't want to -- you know, can you address those concerns that I have from as somebody's who's got a tax --

MR. STEIN:

From a financial standpoint, a financial standpoint, I don't want to get into the political end of it. But from a financial standpoint, the County has been supportive of the college, there's no question about it. Suffolk is probably one of the more supportive counties in the State, I don't think there's a question about it. And there's also no question about the fact that the State has been way behind in terms of its support of community colleges. And that's no secret, everybody knows it, SUNY is well aware of it, the State has not come across with the share that we think is appropriate.

In terms of the expenditures, I just want to point out something that the President said before that has to be kept in mind. While the 4% increase from the County provides \$1.2 million in round numbers, the costs that are being charged to the college by the County have gone up dramatically. We have -- liability insurance has gone up dramatically, worker's comp, health insurance, data systems, these are all chargebacks to the college. So in essence, we're at a net loss because the costs from the County have gone up well over \$2 million and a 4% increase is 1.2 million. So I think we have to look at the detail when we talk about the percentage of increase of cost. Those costs that are under the control of the college have been held down considerably, and I think the President has often made comment about our operating costs per student which is among the lowest.

So, you know, we have to take a look at the entire picture here in terms of the burdens upon the college as well, not only the County. But getting back to the financial aspect, yes, the County has been

very supportive and we certainly appreciate it. We have limited places to go, though.

LEG. CRECCA:
So do we.

MR. STEIN.
I understand that.

LEG. CRECCA:
Fred, if you would just comment on that.

MR. LA LIMA:
I want to --

LEG. CRECCA:
Do you agree with -- all right, I'm sorry, Let me let Sal address it.

MR. LA LIMA:
I just wanted to respond to one point you made about the students, because you're looking at a chart that says the County share increased faster than the student's share. You have to keep in mind that the students were picking up almost 40% of our budget a few years back. What we have been trying to do, and this has been a Statewide issue, we're trying to get everybody to come on board at one-third, and when I say we, the college Presidents of 30 community colleges have a very strong association. The Chancellor in the last few years, two chancellors, Ryan and now King, have been very supportive of the community colleges, we're becoming major players within the SUNY system and more attention is being addressed than ever before. So we have made it really a very high priority to get each of the players -- the State, the students and the counties -- to become one-third players as was the original, let's call it the gentleman's agreement among the three parties. That went way out of whack; it still is in some parts of the state, as Mr. Stein points out. In some parts of the State the sponsors are paying 20%, 18%, 16%, there are other sponsors that are paying 40%, 38%; Nassau pays a much larger percentage, by the way. But I'm not advocating that at all.

I think the original plan was a model I think that everybody should admire, an equal partnership of one-third, one-third, one-third; everybody body got away from it. There was a period where this County gave zero increases for eight years in a row, and then it was through the generosity of the Legislature that in one year you made one big, you know, slam bang and we got like, I don't know, 26 or 27 percent jump which sort of caught up again. But those years led to a lot of structural problems. And while you bring a catch up, there's a lot of damage that was left in the wake of that one catch up. We still are not at the one-third. Now, the County is getting close to that one-third. So again, in support of the County, the County I think should be congratulated for being one of the better counties in

supporting its Community College, but on the other hand we don't want to keep the students at the 35 or 37% level. Now, the State has to start addressing that and that's our mission, we have been working hard on the State level.

37

LEG. CRECCA:

Is that where the students are now? I thought they were at close to one-third, aren't they?

MR. STEIN:

They're above.

MR. LA LIMA:

The students? No, the students are about, what, about 35%.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, okay, 35.

MR. LA LIMA:

So that even though, you know, when you look at the chart you're looking at, they haven't increased as much as the County, they are still paying the biggest share of the college's budget.

LEG. CRECCA:

If I could ask Fred -- thanks, Sal. Yeah, I have it, I have the number right in front of me. Fred, if I could ask you just to address Chuck's comments on -- I think what he was driving at, if I'm correct, is that the County's increased costs and that's what's caused this.

MR. POLLERT:

The --

LEG. CRECCA:

That's what I understood. I don't know if --

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, the County does chargeback the Community College as we charge back all funds for a variety of services that the Community College receives from the County. The County doesn't make a profit when we provide services to the Community College, so whatever costs the Community College has incurred are the costs that they're being charged back. The largest increase obviously has been for the health insurance. There have been substantial run-ups in the health insurance costs, however that would be true if the Community College was with the Empire Plan. Recent studies have shown that, in fact, the County's charges by being self-insured are significantly lower than the Empire Plan.

So while the costs have gone up, they do reflect what the actual

experience of the college is, number one. And number two, those costs are less expensive than if the college were to go out to try to get health insurance through the State of New York and the Empire Plan.

LEG. CRECCA:

Where are the increases primarily coming from? Where are we seeing the jump? In other words, how we got from staying at the same levels last year to about 6.7% more in spending, if you had to pinpoint the big areas.

MR. POLLERT:

The large areas were the expenditure increase in the personnel area

because the Community College, with a variety of union contracts, have automatic step increases. So even absent a union contract, the steps take place no matter what. There have also been increases that were in turn associated with the Health Wellness Center as well as supplies and materials, those types of things as well. So if you look at on page 12, the expenditure increases have broken out, from actual '99 to 2000 the cost of personnel has increased from \$68 million to 72, that's a dramatic increase; that is perhaps the largest increase. The interfund transfers, while they've gone up by \$1 million, have really not been the driving factor with that large increase.

LEG. CRECCA:

You're saying the personnel costs is what's going up the most.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. So it's a personnel cost with the related employee benefits cost which is primarily being driven by the health insurance costs.

LEG. CRECCA:

Do you agree with the Executive's Recommended 2001-2002 Personnel costs which is the 72.6 million?

MR. POLLERT:

We do. We believe that there are sufficient funds within the personnel area to enable the Community College to operate. However, we do mention that the recommended budget takes away the safety net on the reserve account which is troubling in the sense that at the beginning of the year there was a \$4.2 million surplus in that reserve account. The beginning of next year with the transfer out, they're not going to have a safety net or the reserve account and there are no funds included to do The Faculty contract. The faculty contract is going to cost approximately \$342,000 for each percentage increase granted to The Faculty Association. So if you look at the amount of funding that has been provided for personnel services, that level of funding is adequate for the staffing that's currently in place but it is not adequate if there is a Faculty contract.

MR. STEIN:

I just want to point out, with one exception to what Fred said in his report, he does refer to the fact that there is still an additional need of \$92,000 with respect to the AME contract. So --

LEG. CRECCA:

Additional to, what, the current proposed budget?

MR. STEIN:

Yeah. Basically what the Budget Review Office Report said is that in their analysis, the AME agreement that I guess you're going to be voting on next week if adopted would still require an additional \$92,000 in our budget.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Fred, I had a question, if I could just -- if you would yield just for a moment, this is a question very related to what you were saying. On page eight which is where Legislator Crecca had most of his queries, there's a line there which I was not clear on; "If the County chooses

39

to lower it's annual contribution to less than what was adopted last. Year, the college will suffer the loss of additional State aid." Can you explain that?

MR. POLLERT:

The Community College has what's called a maintenance of effort. Once you give the Community College a County contribution in one year, you have to maintain that contribution in the future years. If there is a reduction in the level of the contribution --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Is that in the dollar amount or the percentage amount?

MR. POLLERT:

It's in the dollar amount. So if there's a reduction --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Well, we're safe there.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. Yes, we are.

LEG. CRECCA:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. I was just curious as to what that line meant. Legislator Carpenter has some questions.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Basically it's a comment, and I do believe that the President touched on it. I just want to make sure that no one is unduly misled by part of the information. And in the report where it refers to the fact that the County has increased its contribution 49.9% over the last six years, I think to just put that out there alone is a little disingenuous without stating the fact that for eight years or seven out of eight years the County contribution over previous years was a zero percent increase, and that it wasn't until that one year when we spiked it up 25% in one year that incorporates that 49.9. So, you know, people are going to look at that and say, "Wow, 49% over the last six years. You know, divide it out by six, that's, you know, a healthy contribution each year." But there were so many years that there was zero increase in the County contribution and we're still paying for that.

I think it would be important, especially since we've got a limited time in when we can propose any amendments, for the college to be quite blunt, if you will, any of the recommendations that the Budget Review Office has made that you feel are for whatever reason inaccurate or something that's going to negatively impact the operations at the college, I think you need to come forward and say so.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Or that the County Executive's budget --

40

LEG. CARPENTER:

Certainly both.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, I think now would be the time. Because we have to over the next couple of days, any amendments that we're going to propose to the budget before us we're going to be doing in the next three days or whatever.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Counsel is saying tomorrow.

LEG. CRECCA:

I thought it was Friday.

MR. SABATINO:

Tomorrow is the deadline. That's why this meeting was so important today because tomorrow is the deadline.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Tomorrow is the deadline.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Is it tomorrow or is it Friday?

MR. SABATINO:

For filing the amendments.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

For filing the amendments.

MR. SABATINO:

It will take three or four days to draft them so we'll have them ready --

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. And this is why -- in fact, I thought it was this afternoon, so this was my urgency in asking you to please be very direct with us. Legislator Carpenter is certainly correct in that we need you to be very direct in your reactions to the Budget Review analysis as well as to the County Executive's Recommended Budget. Legislator Foley has a question.

LEG. FOLEY:

Legislator Carpenter, did you want --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Oh, I thought you were finished.

LEG. FOLEY:

Legislator Carpenter wanted a response from the --

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yeah, to the various recommendations, especially those --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Okay. I thought it was a recommendation that they wouldn't have to have any --

LEG. CARPENTER:

Especially those that were asking or recommending that there be reductions in some of the lines.

LEG. FOLEY:

Or increases, there is a difference of opinion by some.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Would you be prepared to give us that right now? I didn't think so.

Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. If we can go back to the beginning for a moment to the Chair of the Board of Trustees. One of the concerns that I have, and I read through the resolution that was adopted in April and, you know, on this side of the table, if you will, WHEREAS clauses have always been by virtue of those kinds of clauses that say preparatory language or prefacing remarks, but where the rubber meets the road as I like to call it, is in the RESOLVED clauses. So where at least this Legislator stands is that when we look at the RESOLVED clause and we look at the fact -- and it wasn't a unanimous decision by the Board of Trustees, Madam Chair, there was a difference of opinion within the board about adopting a 4% increase as opposed to a full needs budget. So where I have concerns, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the official document that you had submitted to the County Executive that is in the RESOLVED portion of the resolution which is the meat of the resolution, to use that metaphor, the board has decided on a split vote, but the majority of the board has decided to submit to the County Executive, and thereby submit to us, a 4% increase. Why should we go above 4% when the board submitted only a 4% increase to the County Executive? That's the my first question.

And just along with that, or as part of your answer to that, was it not the case that there were board members who wanted to go above the 4% and why did not the board at that time adopt a higher amount if you will within their RESOLVED clause to submit to the County Executive, which you do have the option of doing.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

If I may. To address your question specifically, you're absolutely correct that a lot of the board members struggled with this and they looked at it and, you know, of course we would like more money, there is no question about it.

LEG. FOLEY:

Then why wasn't that placed -- then why didn't you place that into the RESOLVED clause? Why didn't you -- if you wanted more money, and some of us have been on the record over the years of giving more money, if you wanted that then why wasn't the enacting resolution reflecting

those concerns that you just articulated, that you wanted more money when, in fact, you've only asked for 4%?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

We always want more money, I mean, there's no --

LEG. FOLEY:

We can only go by -- through the Chair, we can only go by what you have officially -- just as we're bound by our constituents by the way

that we vote, so are other boards and commissions.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

If you look at the resolution, specifically it's the mandate that we looked at as far as submitting in a 4% budget. The caveat that was involved with it was the caveat that it did not take in other considerations. I mean, that was essentially what we did when we submitted in the 4% budget. There are areas that we think that we can tighten up, we tried to tighten it up, but the budget we submitted was a 4% budget. But as I indicated from the outset, it did not take in any consideration as far as any contracts or any other increases that were not on the table that we were cognizant of on April the 6th when the budget was submitted.

LEG. FOLEY:

Why did you not include anticipated monies? Or as the Chair had said at the outset of the meeting, as we do in the General Fund budget, that there are monies that you could set aside that could be used at the discretion of the board, whether for contract increases or for additional staff, why did you not include additional monies for other contracts?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

I believe Mr. Stein addressed that previously, why we could not do that. But to be very --

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, I'd like to hear from you.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

-- candid with you --

LEG. FOLEY:

Why couldn't you do that? You mentioned earlier that you wouldn't be in compliance with State law; is that what you had said at the beginning of the committee meeting?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

This is not the 4%. The 4% was in compliance with the Legislature's adoption of a 4% increase and the request from the County Executive --

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, why not --

TRUSTEE SACCA:

-- to submit a budget within 4% which you understand is required to submit into this Legislative body

LEG. FOLEY:

Why were there not any monies, additional monies proposed in your

budget for future contract settlements that you know were going to -- that were looming on the horizon?

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Mr. Foley, I can give you a very simple answer; supply us the money in the fund balance and we'll have enough money there to tap the resources when we need it. I think that's the simplest way to do it.

LEG. FOLEY:

But the fact remains, particularly when you read the Budget Review Office analysis -- and I mentioned it to the Chair -- major issues include that there's no provision, no provision is made in the proposed budget for negotiated wage increases for The Faculty Association and The Guild of Administrative Offices. Quite frankly, through the Chair, I don't know how the majority of the board can submit a budget proposal to the County Executive and not to us without covering all the anticipated or all the expected expenses for any given year.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Mr. Foley, I don't have a clue how you're going to do that in submitting a budget.

LEG. FOLEY:

It's done every year, we do it every year in the General Fund budget we have monies that are put aside for a variety of either expected settlement -- negotiation settlements or for other kinds of expenses that could loom on the horizon. The fact remains -- and I'll just leave it at this. The fact remains, Mr. Chair, that in the past other boards, you can go up to the 4% increase and you can also do as the President and others have asked in the past which is to also, alongside the 4% -- which, yes, you have to comply with County law -- but that does not prevent, prohibit, stop the board from also submitting a full needs budget or also submitting the budget that they would like to see for the following year, notwithstanding the capital requirements where you have to bring in a budget of only 4%. There's nothing preventing you from a second proposed budget that would meet all the needs of the college and that's what's missing from what we have to review here today.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

Mr. Foley, we're not hiding anything, we laid it out on the table to you. We submitted in a 4% budget and we excluded anything that we were not aware of or what the impact would be and we identified that. My concern is that if you don't have the Reserve Fund, in order to cover those contingencies, we are going to be in trouble.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

I have to agree with what Mr. Foley has said, that it would be easier for us if you didn't give us such a minimal list budget in the future so that we -- if there are cuts that we have something to cut from, if there are additional expenses, you have a budget that's fatter than the one you submitted. You had draft budgets that you had worked on before this final version and at least there we had something to work

down from and I think that's what he's referring to.
I do have one more question for Budget Review and for Chuck, because it's a budgetary question. I'm confused about it and I think that we can go around and around about this, but we really need everybody to think about what the priorities are so that we can put our heads together, we have a deadline tomorrow. The question is on page 23 regarding FICA. Now, it says here in the paragraph just above the Workman's Compensation title, it says, "However, the Budget Review Office believes that the recommended 2001-2002 Personnel Services appropriations are overstated by \$1 million."

MR. STEIN:
This goes back --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay. It goes back to what we were saying?

MR. STEIN:
This goes back to the discussion before where we don't see the one million because --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
The vacancies and the filling of the vacancies.

MR. STEIN:
Right.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay, and that's where that \$70,000 reduction in FICA payments would come from.

MR. POLLERT:
That's right.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
There's discrepancy in, you know, the Budget Review and the college not agreeing in these numbers. Okay, that's where this comes from?

MR. STEIN:
Well, as I stated before, it's my belief that the intention of the administration is that those positions that we cited to be filled will be filled and those that became vacant after we submitted the budget would also be filled. So therefore, we don't see this \$1 million as being available and, therefore, we see that the FICA that's presented is more accurate, that it shouldn't be reduced.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay, that answers my question. I wanted to know where this \$1 million, if it was the same reference. Okay. If there are no further questions --

MR. LA LIMA:
I wanted to add just one comment.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Are there further questions?

MR. LA LIMA:

No. I wanted to comment just so you understand some of the other issues that we also deal with. With tuition, I want to go back to that, there's two things we're dealing with. One, the State has a cap on tuition, it's \$2,500; we're now approaching that, we're at 2,430. Which means unless there's a change, and there hasn't been a change in many, many, many, many years, we're only \$70 away from the cap. Next year --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Budget Review gave us that information in their analysis. Thank you.

MR. LA LIMA:

Now, the other part of it is this. That currently the SUNY Trustees which have the final say in everything, including the budget you approve, it has to be approved by the SUNY Trustees, they also have a position currently that says tuition may not rise more than the percentage increase by the sponsor. Consequently, this year the 4% technically will not allow us to raise the tuition a hundred dollars because the hundred dollar increase is 4.3% increase in tuition. And we received a letter from the Chancellor's office indicating that it's out of compliance with the Trustees. Now, when I say Trustees, I'm talking about the SUNY trustees, okay.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Uh-huh.

MR. LA LIMA:

So that technically, unless your budget is 4.3% or more over last year, our tuition is out of compliance and they could reject it. Now, I don't know whether they have the authority to waive that if they wish, but so far there's been no indication that they're going to waive it. So we don't know where we stand with the tuition, so we could be losing more dollars.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

And that goes back to Mr. Foley's comments and my previous comments, that we need you to ask for those higher levels, especially projecting that kind of tuition increase. Legislator Carpenter has a question.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I have one final question. When you mention the SUNY Trustees, is there -- in the process of them approving the budget that we approve, they have final approval is what you're saying?

MR. LA LIMA:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Is there any recommended amount that they look for to be in the fund balance?

MR. LA LIMA:
That I really don't know.

46

LEG. CARPENTER:
Could you get that information?

MR. LA LIMA:
I'm not sure that they look for that necessarily. I think that's simply what we consider to be a prudent position.

LEG. CARPENTER:
And what is that figure?

MR. LA LIMA:
You know, that you should have -- if you can, you should have a fund balance, we used to work with a nominal figure of 5% and that was basically when we had meetings with the SUNY people, they always recommended you should about a 5% contingency fund or a reserve fund. It's not legislatively or legally mandated, I don't believe, but that's the recommendation that we work with.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Okay. Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
Madam Chair, are we wrapping up the committee meeting or do we have --

LEG. CARPENTER:
There's another meeting.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
There's another meeting that's waiting to begin.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay.

LEG. CRECCA:
Three o'clock Social Services.

LEG. FOLEY:
There will just be several questions then, if I may, Madam Chair, to the President of the college. I know it's been very painful to have

to close sections of classes that have had to take place in the Spring, the Summer and the Fall. Could you just tell the committee what kind of closings are anticipated, section closings for the full semester and how that might be or will be impacting, for lack of a better word, operations or impacting the ability of students to take certain classes on campus? Because I know that's a concern that I know that you have, I know that's a concern of some students that I have spoken to, some of the faculty. And plus, as I've said in a prior committee meeting with the Chair of the Board of Trustees, on the one hand the college wants to see almost a 50% increase in the advertising budget from 600 and \$700,000 that we had adopted, although it was modified, 607 up to over \$900,000 in order to -- purportedly to recruit more students. So at the same time in trying to bring more students on to the campus, there's a whole host of sections, meaning

classes, that are going to be eliminated, closed if you will, in the Fall semester, and I don't know, first of all, how we jived the two, to use that terminology. But secondly, if you could just explain to the committee why there was a need to eliminate sections or classes and how that squares with the strategy of trying to bring more students to the Community College.

MR. LA LIMA:

Okay. Well, let me answer the last part first because I think you were referring to the past year, the one that's --

LEG. FOLEY:

I understand there are sections closed or eliminated for the upcoming year, too, for the Fall semester.

MR. LA LIMA:

Well, each year, you know, what happens is a schedule is build actually a year ahead. And then as we move closer and closer to the time of actually implementing the schedule, there's always some, you know, trimming around the edges, so to speak, so that it fits what we anticipate to be the final enrolment needs and program needs of the college. So that's an ongoing thing and it's -- I'm there 37 years and we've done that for 37 years.

The basic issue that occurred in this past year is that we saw that our budget in the overload adjunct area was over expending by a significant amount and that we had to bring that back into line so that we would not at the end of the year be out of balance. And what we did -- now, we always have board guidelines. The guidelines tell us that a class has to have a minimum size of, and normally that number is 12 and that goes back, that policy was set in the early 70's. So what we did first was we said, okay, any classes that are not at 12, get them out of the schedule because they're out of compliance with board policy. In past years we frequently waived more of that requirement where we had the funding to do it, so we would basically

say, "Okay, there's a class of 10, you know, lets leave it because it's going to disrupt those ten students if we cancel it." But we have to look at a lot of things; where do those ten students go if we do cancel it? Do we have alternate sections of the same course for them to go to?

LEG. FOLEY:

Different times or different days --

MR. LA LIMA:

Times and days.

LEG. FOLEY:

-- which could impact the student's ability to take the class.

MR. LA LIMA:

We wouldn't look at a different campus normally, just on that campus. There would be other like kinds of considerations that we would have to look at before we made that final decision to cut. But when you're in a financial bind, sometimes you say to yourself well, you can't even allow that, you have to cut it and follow the board policy

literally.

LEG. FOLEY:

I don't mean to interrupt, but if there's a board policy of 10 of 12, is that because that's considered the financial break even point?

MR. LA LIMA:

You know, I --

LEG. FOLEY:

I've heard it's as low as -- it all depends on how --

MR. LA LIMA:

It depends on how you calculate it.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right. I've heard it could be as low as low as eight as opposed to 12.

MR. LA LIMA:

Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

And if that's the case, why can't we have -- to use a word that hopefully will come back into fashion -- a more liberal interpretation of the financing, so instead of being 12 it would be eight.

MR. LA LIMA:

Actually --

LEG. FOLEY:

That way students wouldn't have to scramble to find that same course at a different time or a different day.

MR. LA LIMA:

Actually, the break-even point varies from course to course because costs are different, how much you pay the instructor, the number of contact hours for a class. For example, a nursing course might have eight hours, eight contact hours, whereas an English course might have three hours, so the cost of the nursing might be three times as much. And then you throw on top of that there is technical assistance that you have to provide, so the break-even point really is not an easy number to come at.

When the policy was set back in the early 70's, I don't think anybody was thinking dollar signs, they just picked a number and I don't know where it came from; that goes back, I don't know, I'd say 1970 or '71. I've calculated it, coming out of an accounting background, a number of times and I've come up with different numbers. But on an average basis, I usually figure we could -- now, again, break-even meaning direct costs, but then you have to assume an average salary and that's not literally true, you could probably get away with nine, eight or nine.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right. Because you're also including the FTE and the aid from the State and so forth and so on to offset the cost of providing the class

with a professor.

MR. LA LIMA:

Uh-huh, yeah.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. LA LIMA:

But again, as far as the fall schedule, you know, if we see that we're not going to have enough funding to, you know, support the schedule that was put forth by the Deans, we would then have to tell them, "Okay, we can't afford that, based on our cost estimates we're going to have to shrink it." But again, we would have to be academically sensitive, we have to look at all the considerations, what the students need to graduate, are there alternates for them, can we give them independent studies which in some cases worked for certain students.

LEG. FOLEY:

But hasn't that decision -- Mr. President, hasn't that decision been

partly made already, that sections that would have been offered in the Fall have already been eliminated; is that not correct?

MR. LA LIMA:

To my knowledge, only to the extent that we normally do that any -- we keep purging out if we see, you know, certain courses.

LEG. FOLEY:

And that was the 12 student figure as opposed to the eight or nine figure, correct?

MR. LA LIMA:

They would be -- well, at this point, you wouldn't be basing it on enrollment yet, it's too early.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. LA LIMA:

Our numbers really don't flesh out --

LEG. FOLEY:

Unless it's second year courses.

MR. LA LIMA:

Even then, we usually wait for that kind of decision until we're within two weeks or even a week of the classes starting. And if we see weak classes at that point that we would normally run, we might then have to pull them out.

LEG. FOLEY:

I'll get to my next question in a moment, but if the board policy is 12, as you mentioned earlier, and we've just established that it could be as low as eight or nine -- perhaps my questions should be directed towards the Chair -- why couldn't there be a change made in the board

threshold then? Why not the administration make a suggestion to reduce it to eight or nine as opposed to keeping it at 12? Because I know they'd be able to save a number of classes.

TRUSTEE SACCA:

It's well taken, Mr. Foley. The policy of the board, as President LaLima indicated, is correct, but that policy is not being put into concrete. We usually look at the recommendation of administration. If there is specific classes that are needed for graduating or if there's particular circumstances, the board is very reasonable when it comes to those things. So, you know, when you're looking at a policy, I wouldn't look at that as the wherewithal and end, we would look at what the recommendations are.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you. Madam Chair, just my final question, if I may, because of the time involved, but being that it's a \$100 million operation, it really could require even probably hours more. But we could just turn to page 25 and if the President could do the same, the Chair and BRO. There's a very important point here that we need to address and it's the third paragraph, second sentence, it says, "Since no supplemental appropriating resolution has been submitted by the Executive but was requested by the college, the level of expenditures" -- and here's the heart of the matter -- "The level of expenditures included in the estimated budget for this year would be improper and in direct violation of Resolution 847-989 as amended," so forth and so on. "These statutes limit the college to expending no more than what the County Legislature has provided."

My question to Counsel and then to the Budget Review Office -- and if the college wishes to respond to it even directly, that would be fine -- but if, in fact, that the estimated expense column for this year, those expenditures would be improper since there's no supplemental appropriation resolution has been forward yet to us, how do we come to grips with that? I mean, what is it -- how are we to view this legally and then also from Budget Review budgetarily on how to settle the end of this particular budget year for the college if there's no supplemental resolution coming forward. Now, the college has asked for it but none has forthwith been submitted by the County Executive and the fiscal year ends at the end of next month. So first of all, is it not correct -- is it correct, in fact, that the estimated budget line right now is listed improperly since there has been no supplemental appropriation resolution?

MR. SABATINO:

Well, the key issue is that you cannot expend more than appropriations, it's a very, very, very serious breach from a fiduciary and from a governmental standpoint to, in fact, expend more than your appropriations. Now, what may, in fact, happen is what's happened in the Operating Budget in prior years which is that there's a year-end reconciliation bill that will adjust those appropriations back and forth, but that year-end resolution would have to happen between now and the end of August.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

And we would be facing that when we're facing the Operating Budget.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right.

MR. POLLERT:

No, what the problem is is that the academic year for the Community College is also their fiscal year, so they're close to the end of their fiscal year. So something really has to be done --

MR. SABATINO:

That's what I said, I said before the end of August.

MR. POLLERT:

Right, okay.

MR. SABATINO:

And you guys shook your head saying no, but it's -- it's a serious matter but we've had that problem in the general Operating Budget.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right.

MR. SABATINO:

It's been dealt with in the past, usually it's the year-end -- that year-end being a different year-end which is December. But my point was that it would have to be resolved before the end of August.

LEG. FOLEY:

To the college, when did you request of the County Executive to submit the appropriation?

MR. STEIN:

The board requested -- by resolution, the board requested supplemental appropriation in April. By review of the budget, what it appears is -- and really the Executive Office should speak to this -- but it appears as though what they have done is they have registered in the status of funds section in the front of the budget document that there would be a deficit in this year to be addressed next year from the fund balance; rather than give us a supplemental appropriation, it appears as though that's the way the Executive handled it. But the college did request a supplemental appropriation.

LEG. FOLEY:

Understood. Now, just on that, you know, a series of answer creates other questions. Fred, just the explanation we just heard, can the County Executive, in fact, treat it in that fashion, that without the supplemental appropriation resolution, just simply have as a carry over of a deficit from one fiscal year to the next. I mean, is that generally accepted accounting principals or, you know, is it -- are we trading in Nassau type of budgeting?

MR. POLLERT:

You can treat it that way but it would not be proper. The lack of appropriations puts both the Community College financial individuals as well as the administration in a real box. The County Comptroller really has no authority to approve the over expenditure of funds. Therefore, potentially what could occur is that bills will not be paid

at the end of the year because there are no available appropriations and they'll just roll over and be charged to the following year which is going to put a further problem and difficulties on the community college's operating budget for next year. So if they have ordered supplies and equipment and they have no appropriations to pay for it, they will be charged to next year because the Comptroller cannot allow the Community College to over expend available appropriations. So the proper way to do it is to do a transfer from the reserve account this year which would give them the authority to expend those additional funds.

In addition to that, a resolution is also required because when the Legislature adopted the budget last year, funds were lock-boxed in a variety of different accounts. The Community College has assumed that those accounts would sweep where there are surpluses to cover some of the shortfalls, however a Legislative resolution is, in fact, required to break those funds out of the lock-boxes, in particular the surpluses which are in the academic instruction account for the new titles that were added to the budget but were not completely filled.

LEG. FOLEY:

Plus the instructional supplies line that was also lock-boxed. Okay. Madam Chair, if I just may end with this. I would hope because tomorrow is the deadline that the college and BRO could get together on this issue on page 13 of what is the approximate surplus in permanent salary accounts for next year given they're going to fund only -- fill only ten positions and the issue of, you know, there were some retirements. But we really need to have that figure in place before --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Well, clearly there are a number of issues to be addressed between the college and BRO. Are there any comments from anyone else who is present? Ellen Schuller-Mauk, come forward, please. Just make sure you have a live mike there, Ellen.

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:

Is this one live? Good. Ellen Schuller-Mauk, President, The Faculty Association. I would just like to reiterate probably more bluntly than what the College President and Board Chairman have stated, but the college budget that's before you is woefully inadequate. It was a bare bones budget, it was very, very tight. We feel that it did not adequately allow for any flexibility in terms of dealing with full-time staffing and adjunct staffing as needed by the demands of student enrollment.

Last year when we came before the Legislature we had asked for 21 new additional full-time faculty lines in addition to vacancies that needed to be filled, and part of this was a strategic proposal over a three year period to address filling -- having more full-time faculty lines at the college than adjunct or part-time lines. And last year when we came before you we asked for 25 full-time lines for this year, we were able to fund -- you funded 21 of them and we indicated that we would want an additional 14 lines which would be for this coming academic year, an additional new 14 lines in the year 2002-2003 and that this would go a long way toward getting at least a 60%

full-time/part-time for full-time staffing. Obviously, we have moved way back from that. That we still have as many adjuncts as we have full-time, the ratio of adjuncts is still the same to full-time faculty lines. We still have not reached what we think is an appropriate compliment in terms of dealing with full-time faculty in the classroom, we have had to fill lines that deal with professional assistance to meet the needs of technology, so we're not even talking about that in this budget at all. And in even in terms of some of the questions that you've asked, we're not even addressing that whatsoever. To fill ten vacant lines, okay, just deals with vacancies, it doesn't even deal with moving ahead to try to add additional full-time lines.

But in addition to that, we're talking about a budget that does not include any increase whatsoever for, you know, the anticipated Faculty settlement. There is no other bargaining unit in the County where there is not funding that is made available for the negotiated settlements, and our contract does expire at the end of this month and we think that there needs to be some sort of provision dealing with that.

But in addition to that, I think that there are also other serious concerns in the budget. All of you should have received I believe from Chuck Stein last week -- and if not, I do have extra copies -- where he had some consideration for aspects of the budget that were different from what the County Executive was proposing and what the college felt was needed, and part of this has to deal -- and I'm just going to highlight a few of them. But for instance, dealing with replacement computers, we are an educational institution and we have to keep up with the kind of computing technology. All of our courses, all of our programs, our student services all depend on computers and if we aren't going on some sort of regular computer maintenance, you know, we might as well go back to the old typewriters. You know, we need to keep it up, the technology is changing constantly. And I think what the college had asked for which was, you know, a little bit less than \$60,000 is hardly, you know, an extravagant sum to keep up with, again, the changing technology.

The same issue which is a \$100,000 issue dealt with computer software. This was not for additional software, this is money just to keep up the college's licenses; if the college doesn't have licenses we can't use -- you know, we can't use the software. I mean, this is not frivolous, this is not excessive, this is not something that can be moved over into another account. Similarly with banking fees, banking fees are increasing; again, the Community College depends on students paying their tuition by using credit cards and these are just the normal fees that go along with paying for that. Same thing with telephone and telegraph, dealing with, you know, the cabling and connectivity in classrooms, in labs, in work stations throughout the college; again, this is just to maintain what we're currently doing now. Again, there's a whole list that the college gave but these are items that I think need to be highlighted.

In addition, in the Budget Review Report they talk about the fact that there is I think approximately -- there's shortfall also in terms of what's anticipated for health insurance costs and they also talk about

the under funding in terms of the AME contract which is imminent being voted on by the Legislature. So we're talking about, you know, much more than a 4% increase that is needed just to maintain, you know, basic, essential costs of doing business at the college. And I don't see any way around dealing with the college budget. It's not going to be funded through the 4% that the County Executive has proposed.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Or that the college asked for.

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:
Um, well --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
Which is the problem which the Trustees asked for. And you're preaching to the choir here because we are really on board with what you're saying, Ellen, that the college with the bare bones presentation and the County Executive with the bare bones response is not addressing the academic needs of the college. And this is what Brian has been underscoring for the past half hour and what I had said before that, we need to have a real presentation made to us by the college Trustees in this frame so that we could see what the real needs are, and then work from there and not have such a bare bones presentation in April. That we can't come up -- it's not our position to come up with the academic ideas for the Trustees as to what the institutional needs are, it's the purview of the Trustees to come to us with a fatter budget with which we can begin to work. And I believe that's exactly what Legislator Foley has been saying.

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:
The fact we've all heard that, but the fact of the matter is is that this is not April, 2002. We're faced right now with August, 2001 --

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
And we appreciate that, absolutely.

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:
-- and we have to address what may have been an oversight which may have been a tactical error on a lot of people's parts. But that doesn't, you know, exclude that.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:
This is why we'll be working tomorrow before our deadline comes up tomorrow afternoon. Legislator Crecca has a question.

LEG. CRECCA:

I have a quick comment and it's just -- it's not directed at you, but earlier I had pointed out that there was a 6% cumulative average increase from the sponsor, from Suffolk County every year in spending, if you look back. And what I did was I asked Fred to go back further because there was an allegation, you know, that that was because it was such a bleak period there where there was no increases. But going back as far as 1984, it actually turns out from 84 to the current year it turns out to be a 6% average annual increase of the County's contribution, our portion. And that's just to give you an idea. There were a lot of years with zeroes in there, but there were also a lot of

55

years with 23%, 18%, 25%, you know, and if you balance them all out it comes out to a 6% increase.

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:

Andrew, I don't -- you know, I haven't looked back as far as 1984, but I have been the union President since 1979 and other than in 1995-96 when there was a 25% increase, I don't remember years where there were 18% increases.

LEG. CRECCA:

1988-89 was 17.8% -- I'm not arguing with you, I'm just letting you know, I'm looking at the numbers -- 1985-86 was a 23% increase and 1984-85 was a 9% increase; those were the biggest year that we saw increases other than the 96 -97. And I'm not saying that an increase isn't justified, that's not my point. It's just that we've got to somehow control -- and I think -- I don't necessarily agree a hundred percent with what Legislator Foley and Legislator Fisher said. I understand the concept, it's not a bad idea, show us everything you want and then we can cut and all that, but I think it's also incumbent upon the Trustees and responsible upon the Trustees to give us a lean budget, as lean as you can get it when you're going to stay within cap laws and things like that. So I don't necessarily agree with the theory that you should submit us a big fat budget and let us cut it, I think you should show us where lean and bottom line is what you need.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

But it can't be below operational needs.

LEG. CRECCA:

I don't disagree with you. I'm just saying, there's sort of a balance in-between those two, that's all I'm saying.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Yeah.

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:

Andrew, I'd like to make a comment and I know the President does as well. You know, I think it's very easy to get caught up in percentage figures. I mean, what we're talking about in terms of basic needs is

not astronomical figures in terms of the overall college budget, and I think we have to keep that in line. If you look at, you know, the average cost to a household in Suffolk County to maintain the Community College budget is a 4% increase, it works out -- it's \$7.60 cents per year per average household, that's two cents a day. So --

LEG. CRECCA:

I understand, Ellen. But --

MS. SCHULLER-MAUK:

With very little of an increase.

LEG. CRECCA:

And we have to be very conscious of that because it's those people who call us and say, you know, "My taxes are going up again, my taxes are

going up again." I understand what you're saying and I don't disagree with you. You know, you're right, we should probably spend more money than is even proposed here and then some to really bring the college to where it needs to be. I'm just saying that, you know, we've got to try to get more aid and maybe a little bit more contribution from students to increase that spending and not always turn to the taxpayer. You know, we should really -- we have a cap compliance law, we should try to stay within it, that's really my point; I'm not saying we'll be able to do that but we should try.

MR. LA LIMA:

I think your point is well taken, Legislator Crecca. The comment I would just like to make is that most of our costs are non-discretionary. In effect, to us they become mandates, whether they're contractual increases that are negotiated by the County or whether they're medical costs or related items, including County charges to us for services which have increased astronomically. So we really have very little room where we have discretion and that comes with supplies, equipment, and once you get past that there's not much else you can do.

Again, I'll just remind you that when you take all the community colleges and take the cost of our budget and divide it by the number of FTE's, we still are in the bottom half of the pack, I mean, we are still one of the more efficient operators. Almost every school district in Suffolk County this year had budget increases exceeding 7%. And I think when you look at the fact that we operate three campuses with a high overhead and we operate 12 months a year, six days and sometimes seven days a week, and we operate from seven in the morning till ten at night, I think there's a lot of bang for the buck. So, you know, that's a good selling point to the taxpayers. I think there's a lot of value that comes out of every dollar that goes into the college from the County side. But I appreciate your position, I understand that as well. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FISHER:

Thank you very much. I did want the members of the committee to know that my aide has distributed the marketing report that was given to me by Eric Ricioppo and by Mr. Sacca when they came to my office to

discuss the advertising and marketing plans. So you should have that; if you don't, please see Elizabeth.

Thank you all for being here. It's been a very important discussion and I think I will be speaking with some of you tomorrow. Thank you. Bye-bye. The meeting is adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.*)

Legislator Vivian Fisher, Chairperson
Education & Youth Committee

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically